

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MALIK M. JUSTIN,  
Plaintiff,

v.

SF STATE UNIVERSITY,  
Defendant.

Case No. [25-cv-03492-TSH](#)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Plaintiff Malik M. Justin initiated this lawsuit by filing a complaint (ECF No. 1) and application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2). Based on the information provided in his application, the Court was unable to determine whether Plaintiff is entitled to proceed in forma pauperis. For instance, while Plaintiff states he is not presently employed, for past employment, he wrote in a number then crossed it out and wrote in his initials, so there is no information about his past employment. For question 2 (“Have you received, within the past twelve (12) months, any money from any of the following sources”), he checked yes for every box, then crossed out all the yesses and put in his initials – it is unclear what that means, since he didn’t check the no box for any of them. Plaintiff also states he is or was a radio music artist, but he doesn’t provide information about how much money he made. For question 5 (“Do you own or are you buying a home?”), he checked both yes and no, crossed out the yes, then wrote no above the yes line and yes above the no line. For question 7 (“Do you have a bank account?”), Plaintiff answered both yes and no, then crossed out both answers and wrote in his initials. He also wrote in a bank (Credit Bank), but he doesn’t say what the balance is. For question 8 (“What are your monthly expenses?”), Plaintiff doesn’t list any. As such, the Court denied Plaintiff’s application and directed him to file a revised in forma pauperis application or pay the \$405 filing fee by May 13,

2025. ECF No. 9. Plaintiff has failed to respond.

The Court possesses the inherent power to dismiss an action sua sponte “to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-33 (1962). Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines. Plaintiff shall file a declaration by June 2, 2025. Notice is hereby provided that failure to file a written response will be deemed an admission that you do not intend to prosecute, and this case will likely be dismissed. Thus, it is imperative the Court receive a written response by the deadline above.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 19, 2025

  
THOMAS S. HIXSON  
United States Magistrate Judge